

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/601,324	CRONIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Suzanne M. Noakes, Ph.D.	1653	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Suzanne M. Noakes. (3) \_\_\_\_.
- (2) David Weitz. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 14 September 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 5, 6 and 17.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Suzanne M. Noakes  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner called Mr. Weitz to propose claim amendments which would place the application in condition for allowance. Specifically, the examiner suggested combining claims 1, 5 and 6 into a single independent claim so as to define the crystal by SEQ ID No., space group and unit cell dimensions. Mr. Weitz agreed to this in principle. The examiner also suggested amending the composition claim 17, to include a proviso which would exclude all of the crystals which the claim potentially reads on, but for which applicants are not enabled or have written description for. Mr. Weitz disagreed with this requirement reasoning that there was no legal basis for requiring Applicants to limit themselves in such a way. Thus, it was agreed that a new non-final office action would be issued which reflected the requirements for claim 17 as the issues regarding this claim had not been raised in the previous Office action.